

1	BRUNO W. TARABICHI, CA State Bar No. 215129			
2	bruno@legalforcelaw.com ROY MONTGOMERY, CA State Bar No. 279531			
3	kuscha@legalforcelaw.com LEGALFORCE RAJ ABHYANKER, P.C.			
4	1580 W. El Camino Real, Suite 13 Mountain View, California 94040			
5	Telephone: 650.965.8731 Facsimile: 650.989.2131			
6				
7	Attorneys for Defendant Raj Abhyanker			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION			
11	NEXTDOOR.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation,	Case No. 3	:12-cv-05667-EMC	
12	Plaintiff,		ED] ORDER GRANTING	
13	vs.	DISQUAL	ANT'S MOTION TO IFY PLAINTIFF	
14	RAJ ABHYANKER, an individual,	NEXTDOOR'S COUNSEL		
15	Defendant.	Date: Time:	Thursday, June 6, 2013 1:30 PM	
16		Location:	San Francisco Courthouse, Courtroom 5	
17		Judge:	Honorable Edward M. Chen	
18	RAJ ABHYANKER, an individual,			
19	Counterclaimant,			
20	vs.			
21	NEXTDOOR.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation; PRAKASH JANIKIRAMAN,			
22	an individual; BENCHMARK CAPITAL PARTNERS VII, L.P., a Delaware limited			
23	partnership; BENCHMARK CAPITAL MANAGEMENT CO. VII LLC, a			
24	Delaware limited liability company; SANDEEP SOOD, an individual;			
25	MONSOON COMPANY, an unknown business entity, and DOES 1–50, inclusive;			
26	Counterdefendants.			
27	Counterderendants.			
28				

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISQUALIFY (CASE NO. 4:12-ev-05667-DMR)

Case3:12-cv-05667-EMC Document72 Filed04/25/13 Page2 of 2

1	Defendant Raj Abhyanker has moved, pursuant to Rule 7 of the Federal Rules of Civil		
2	Procedure, to disqualify Plaintiffs' counsel in the above-captioned case.		
3	Good cause appearing, the Court hereby GRANTS Abhyanker's Motion to Disqualify for		
4	the following reason:		
5			
6	Fenwick & West's prior representation of Defendant and Defendant's company provided		
7	the firm with access to confidential information that is both material to its representation of the		
8	Plaintiff in the current action, and adverse to the interests of a former client. Fenwick's		
9	representation of Nextdoor.com, Inc. is thus violative of the California Rule of Professional		
10	Conduct 3-310 (e); accordingly, the firm is disqualified from representing the Plaintiff in this		
11	matter.		
12			
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
14			
15			
16	Dated:		
17			
18			
19	EDWARD M. CHEN		
20	United States District Judge		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING		